

we have a better alternative, a much more fiscally alternative budget put before us by the gentleman from Texas. This budget would further reduce spending, would further rein in government growth, and would take on the mandatory spending programs that are going to bankrupt our country.

What the gentleman from Texas does with this alternative budget is rein in government spending and mandatory programs further, further reduce non-discretionary spending, while at the same time funding the President's budget when it comes to defense and homeland security, two top priorities of this Congress. But, additionally, it continues the tax cuts. It continues returning the taxpayers' money to them at home.

So I think it is important that we keep all those notions in mind as we vote for this budget. I encourage those on the other side of the aisle who ask for more fiscal discipline to come on over and vote for this budget because it is a reasonable thing to do, the right thing to do. It is the right thing to do for the taxpayers, the right thing to do for the American people; and I encourage them to vote for the budget.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), one of the outstanding conservative leaders of this Congress, the chairman of the 100-member Republican Study Committee.

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise to commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), who is a man of principle and a man of personal courage, in his quest to restore fiscal discipline to Washington, D.C. In just a few short years, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) has emerged as a national leader on fiscal restraint in Washington, D.C., and it is an honor for me to be associated with his handiwork in support of the Hensarling amendment.

I too join in the chorus of those conservatives who have spoken tonight in commendation of the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE), who has, in fact, produced the most conservative budget since the historic years of the Reagan administration. And the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), who history may be calling him to other duties sometime soon, will leave a lasting and indelible mark on the budget at the Federal level, and we are grateful for his principled leadership and support as well.

I do support the Hensarling amendment, though, which today was endorsed by the 350,000-member National Taxpayers Union, Americans for Tax Reform, just to name a few, because it is long past time for Congress to put our fiscal house in order.

The OMB estimates the total fiscal outlays in 2005 will be a stunning 33

percent higher than outlays as recently as fiscal year 2001. We have seen extraordinary growth in various departments, including spending in the Department of Education, which has grown at almost twice the rate of even military spending. Spending at the Labor Department will have risen 26 percent during the same period.

The RSC budget, known as the Hensarling amendment, would provide for needed restraint by reducing non-defense-related discretionary spending by 2 percent and calling for \$57 billion more in savings than the Committee on the Budget's budget; but better yet, the RSC's budget would dramatically enhance the possibility that Members will adhere to the spending levels set out in the budget resolution by providing bold initiatives in process reform, point of order protection, forcing Congress to define emergency spending and account for it in the budget, creating budget protection accounts that would allow spending cuts to be directed toward deficit reduction or tax relief, just to name a few proposals.

The RSC budget is an opportunity for Members of Congress to vote for the President's number on defense and homeland security and a little bit less than the Committee on the Budget's number on everything else. Voting for the RSC budget is voting for finding more savings in the largest category of Federal spending, mandatory spending. And voting for the RSC budget is voting for a way to enforce the budget that the House passes and to embrace a series of budget process reforms, which, if they are not successful in the Hensarling amendment, may yet be entertained by the 109th Congress in the months and days ahead.

I strongly support the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), his courage, his principle; and I urge support of all of my colleagues of the Hensarling amendment.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

For some people, Mr. Chairman, we just cannot get enough government. But we are drowning in a sea of red ink already.

This is not a debate about how much we are going to spend on health care and education and housing. This is a debate about who is going to do the spending. We believe families should do the spending. We believe good things come from freedom, from opportunity, and freedom for families to choose the health care that is right for them, to choose the education opportunities for their children that are right for them, to find the best job in a competitive market economy. We cannot have unlimited government and unlimited opportunity. The Republican Study Committee believes in unlimited opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, we urge the adoption of this amendment; but should it fail, please, we ask the House to vote for the Nussle budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As I said before, I rise with reluctant opposition. What the RSC has done is bold; it is worth consideration. It will be part of the consideration as we go through the process, I am sure, throughout the rest of the year as well as we consider the budgets in years to come. But I would ask, as the author of the amendment just did, that while consideration be given that we adopt the underlying bill. And, therefore, I oppose the amendment, but with a great amount of respect and admiration for the work that has been done.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) will be postponed.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE) having assumed the chair, Mr. LATOURETTE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 95) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2006, revising appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2005, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2007 through 2010, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1334, PROTECTION OF INCAPACITATED PERSONS ACT OF 2005

Mr. GINGREY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-20) on the resolution (H. Res. 162) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1334) to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the removal to Federal court of certain State court cases involving the rights of incapacitated persons, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. GINGREY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report